

1           A public hearing of the Jefferson Proving Ground  
2           Restoration Advisory Board meeting was held at the Madison  
3           Jefferson County Public Library, 420 West Main Street,  
4           Madison, IN at 7:00 P.M. on February 5, 2004.

5

6                   **OPENING STATEMENTS BY MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

7                   Okay. Good evening. I would like to  
8           welcome everyone. This is Jefferson Proving Ground  
9           Restoration Advisory Board meeting. I'm Paul Cloud. I work  
10          for the Army. I'm the Army's co-chair ah for the  
11          Restoration Advisory Board. If you haven't signed in please  
12          do so and make sure that you're - if you're not on the  
13          mailing list that you are placed on it. And if you've  
14          changed your address please indicate that and we'll make  
15          sure our mailing list is kept up to date. There's a copy  
16          of the handouts and slides that you will see tonight and  
17          they're back on the table along with ah the sign in sheet  
18          and a copy of the agenda. I'd like to thank everyone for  
19          coming out tonight. Have no other comments but at this time  
20          I would like to turn the meeting over for some introductory  
21          comments from Richard Hill, the community co-chair of the  
22          RAB. Richard?

23

24

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**MR. RICHARD HILL:**

Thank you Paul. Ah just have a few comments to start out with. For one (1) thing I did not expect the turn out to be really great tonight and I think we're meeting my expectations ah because of the weather you know. It's pretty yucky out there right now and especially our - some of the people that we have that are usually here from up around Bloomington area I don't expect them to be here tonight because I think the farther north we go the icier it's going to be. Ah and just one (1) other thing right now. I - I was just thinking on the way down here tonight that I really think that we may be beginning to see the light or some lights at the end of some tunnels now. Anyway ah things are moving along and being wrapped up and we're going to talk some more about some of those things tonight and just ah pretty near everything is going to be transferred that's going to be transferred before too awful long. And I think this long enjoyable process is ah - at least we can see an end to it now. That's all I have right now. Thanks for coming in this weather though.

1  
2           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**  
3  
4

5                               Thank you Richard. This is a copy of the  
6 agenda we'll be talking about tonight. These are the  
7 specific topics. If you have any questions on any of these  
8 topics or any other questions we do have an open discussion  
9 period at the end but if you feel it's urgent enough don't  
10 hesitate to ask your question at any time and we'll discuss  
11 that at that time. The ah first subject is the update on  
12 the Findings of Suitability to Transfer certain parcels at  
13 the Proving Ground specifically ah the Airfield parcel, the  
14 Northeastern parcel and the Western Wooded parcel. Ah just  
15 to give you some history on the Airfield parcel the Final  
16 FOST was signed in December of 2002. Mr. Ford of Ford  
17 Lumber and Building Supply was supplied with that Deed in  
18 July of 2003. In September he signed the Deed. Ah later in  
19 September that Deed was sent to the Army for signature, was  
20 signed and the property was transferred on December 2nd.  
21 Mr. Ford now owns that parcel and that is the parcel shown  
22 in this picture right here (indicating). It's approximately  
23



1 will be transferred this month. That may or may not occur.

2 It may be next month but we expect within the next thirty  
3 (30) to sixty (60) days that the parcel will be transferred.

4 And for your information this is the parcel that we were  
5 referring to (indicating). It's the Northeast corner of the  
6 cantonment area and that will be transferred again to Ford  
7 Lumber and Building Supply as part of his Lease in  
8 Furtherance of Conveyance. Are there any questions  
9 regarding this particular parcel? Okay. The next parcel we  
10 have is the Western Wooded parcel. As I think most people  
11 who have been following this issue or have come to any of  
12 the more recent RAB meetings are aware in May of last year  
13 the Army approved the County's request for a Public Benefit  
14 Conveyance as a park for this parcel. The Draft FOST was  
15 provided for public review and comment in June of last year.

16 We asked for comments and concurrence by August. We  
17 received comments from the EPA. On the first of August we  
18 received concurrence from the community and the State,  
19 Indiana Department of Environmental Management in July and  
20 August of last year. In September the Army responded to the  
21 EPA comments and also revised the document. And in October  
22 we received a concurrence from the EPA on that document.

23

24

1       The document was forwarded to the Pentagon for signature in  
2       November and in middle of December the document was approved  
3       and signed by the Secretary in the Pentagon. We are  
4       currently estimating February for a transfer of what they  
5       call Assignment of a National Park Service. And if you have  
6       a question regarding that when you get into what you call a  
7       Public Benefit Conveyance to a community they have to have a  
8       federal sponsor for federal property. In this case the  
9       National Park Service is that sponsor. What will happen is  
10      the Army will transfer the property to the National Park  
11      Service who will subsequently transfer it to the County.  
12      That's the process that was used for the park parcel at  
13      Krueger Lake that already belongs to the County as a county  
14      park. We are anticipating that assignment from the Army to  
15      the National Park Service will be in February. Again it  
16      might be thirty (30) to sixty (60) days for that and then  
17      probably within thirty (30) days right now we're estimating  
18      March for the transfer to the County. That will be plus or  
19      minus thirty (30), sixty (60) days also. Are there any  
20      questions regarding that? This is a picture of where that  
21      parcel is (indicating). Ken?

22

23

24

1                   **MR. KEN KNOUF:**

2                   Paul has it been determined, the Eastern  
3                   boundary of that Western Wooded parcel being Tokyo Road, has  
4                   that been determined exactly what the boundary is on that  
5                   property?

6

7                   **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

8

9                   As you know the - the item that is currently  
10                  controlling the transfer of the Northeastern parcel and the  
11                  Western Wooded parcel is the issue of roadway rights-of-way  
12                  between ah the two (2) park parcels through the cantonment  
13                  area and whether or not such a roadway right-of-way will be  
14                  granted or it will be necessary to exit the Proving Ground  
15                  on ah 421, go south of the Proving Ground and around and  
16                  come in Gate 19. Ah because of that there was a meeting  
17                  held at the Proving Ground about three (3) weeks ago and  
18                  during that meeting with Mr. Ford and the County  
19                  Commissioner that specific question you raised regarding  
20                  Tokyo Road was raised. The original survey that was done by  
21                  the County of this parcel which was not known to us until  
22                  just a couple of months ago actually showed in the northern

23

24

1 part of ah Tokyo Road, just above where that little dog leg  
2 is, the ah survey showed it was actually east of Tokyo Road  
3 by fifty (50) to a hundred (100) feet. That would obviously  
4 have to be changed since that is part of Mr. Ford's property  
5 and part of the Airfield parcel which has been transferred  
6 to him. So as a minimum that would have to be changed at  
7 least to the center line of Tokyo Road. The other thing  
8 that needed to be changed is on the western boundary there,  
9 the survey only goes up to the fence line. The Army's  
10 property actually extends ten (10), fifteen (15), twenty  
11 (20) feet beyond the fence line. The Army has no desire to  
12 retain that little sliver between the fence line and outside  
13 the fence line. So the survey will have to be redone to  
14 cover those two (2) issues. At this meeting that was held  
15 approximately three (3) weeks ago there was an indication  
16 from the County that they would agree that the survey ah  
17 addressing the issue of where on Tokyo Road or not on Tokyo  
18 Road ah the County's eastern boundary would be indicated  
19 that as long as they were given a roadway right-of-way on  
20 Tokyo Road they had no problem bringing that eastern  
21 boundary ah west to the western side of Tokyo Road. Whether  
22 or not that is ultimately done or not will probably hinge at  
23



1       least to a certain degree on the resolution of this roadway  
2       right-of-way issue between Krueger Lake parcel and the  
3       Western Wooded parcel. Does that answer your question?

4

5               **MR. KEN KNOUF:**

6                       Yes.

7

8               **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

9                       Kind of a long answer but you needed to know  
10       a little bit about the background before we - I just  
11       answered your question because if I had just answered it it  
12       wouldn't have made a whole lot of sense. Any other  
13       questions? Kevin?

14

15               **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

16                       Ah jumping back one (1).

17

18               **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

19                       Un-huh (yes).

20               **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

21                       We did an Amendment on the FOST for the  
22       Northeast parcel.

23

24

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

Yes.

**MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

For the area down by the gate. Is that something you want to discuss?

**MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

Yes. Thank you for bringing that up. Ah at the time the Northeastern parcel FOST was written the Army still had access control at the ah former guard shack at the main gate. And it was not known at that time when that access control would be eliminated. Last year we wrote the EPA and told them we were planning on dis-establishing that access control there because we had brought it into an area interior to the cantonment area around a very specific area where we have barbed wire fence around it. The EPA concurred and approved that initiative and as a result we took the access control people off of the main gate point. What we did not address at that time was the fact that because of that we could incorporate and include in this

1 parcel all of Ordnance Drive from Shun Pike to the main gate  
2 and that little section right there (indicating) where you  
3 see ah the eastern perimeter of roadway enter to Ordnance  
4 Drive. It's a little kind of a pie shaped ah area there,  
5 triangle shaped. So when we realized that and realized that  
6 the survey had already been done and it incorporated those  
7 two (2) areas and it was - there was no real reason not to  
8 include this we went through an amendment process that ah  
9 included those two (2) areas and notified the State and the  
10 EPA that we were in fact amending the FOST including those  
11 areas and it had no significance or bearing or adverse  
12 effect on the content of the original FOST. Did that  
13 explain it to your satisfaction Kevin?

14

15 **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

16 I understand.

17

18 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

19

20

21 Okay thank you. I kind of thought you did  
22 but I'm glad you asked the question so we could explain it

23

24

1 to some other people. If they had compared this diagram to  
2 one (1) of the previous ones they would have noticed a  
3 slight variance there in those boundaries. Okay. If there  
4 are no further questions on the ah FOST and the property  
5 transfers I would like to get into the status of the License  
6 Termination/License Amendment for the Depleted Uranium  
7 License that the Army holds with the Nuclear Regulatory  
8 Commission for the Depleted Uranium at JPG. Now the first  
9 couple of slides will be ah things you've seen before but  
10 they give you a kind of a chronological sequence of where  
11 we've been and what we've done to get where we are. We have  
12 submitted or had submitted in the past a License Termination  
13 Plan to the NRC back in 2002. The documents were posted on  
14 JPG web site. They were mailed to the entire JPG mailing  
15 list which is over two hundred (200) people. And as it says  
16 there in the last bullet that those documents may have  
17 prompt the NRC to seek additional information which could  
18 impact any review that the NRC was doing or any schedule  
19 that they may have had. The NRC started their Acceptance  
20 and Modified Technical Review or Preliminary Technical  
21 Review of the License Termination Plan in July of 2002 and  
22 in October of that year the Army received a notification  
23

1       that they had accepted that ah document, actually both  
2       documents, the LTP which is the License Termination Plan and  
3       the Environmental Report which is the ER. It had passed  
4       their Administrative Review criteria and they were now  
5       commencing a Detailed Technical Review which was estimated  
6       to take approximately two (2) years. Ah in the meantime,  
7       and this slide may be a little out of sequence with the one  
8       (1) that will probably follow it, but in the meantime the  
9       Army had re-evaluated its position and had submitted in  
10      February of last year almost to the date of this meeting a  
11      year ago a Contingent Request to the NRC for a Possession  
12      Only License Amendment. And as this slide shows  
13      (indicating) the Army received a letter from the NRC  
14      accepting that proposal in April of last year. As a result  
15      in July of last year there was a meeting of the NRC to go  
16      over some of the criteria that would be required to - for  
17      the Army to place into their License Amendment request and  
18      that was open to the public. Richard, and I think some of  
19      the people that he uses for his technical support,  
20      participated in it. And there were some people from the  
21      Proving Ground that also listened in. Go back a couple of  
22      slides. In the meantime what had happened was under the

1 License Termination ah process the Save the Valley  
2 organization had requested under the NRC regulations a  
3 hearing which had been granted under the License Termination  
4 proposal. Because no progress was being made under the  
5 License Termination process and it appeared that the Army  
6 and the NRC were going to proceed with the Possession Only  
7 License Amendment the Administrative Hearing Judge ah made a  
8 request to the parties involved, the NRC, Save the Valley  
9 and the Army as to whether or not they felt that the hearing  
10 that had been granted for determination was now moot, in  
11 other words didn't need to be carried forward. Ah the Army  
12 and the NRC argued that they believed the issue was moot.  
13 Save the Valley disagreed. As a result of that the Judge  
14 convened a conference call in December of last year to try  
15 and come to a consensus and a resolution on this issue that  
16 all parties could find acceptable. At the end of that  
17 conference call there was a general consensus that the  
18 hearing request would be ah mooted but it would be mooted  
19 without prejudice. Basically what that means - Richard I  
20 will let you explain that. You can probably do it better  
21 than I.

22

23

24

1                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

2                   Well if it was dismissed with prejudice that  
3                   would mean to me that it could never be brought up again.  
4                   So this is probably a way of saying that right now the  
5                   License Termination Plan is moot because the Army has  
6                   basically abandoned that plan and is going for the  
7                   Amendment, License Amendment and so it does make more sense  
8                   to - if - if the hearing is going to be done that it be done on  
9                   the License Amendment and not the Termination Plan. So -  
10                  but there was the question in there as to whether or not the  
11                  ah - if the License Amendment were denied then we would be  
12                  back in the position where the License Termination Plan may  
13                  take over again. And so this would allow us to get back  
14                  into the process if that were to happen. Does that make any  
15                  sense at all?

16

17                  **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

18                  And Save the Valley would be able to do that  
19                  without any undue burden.

20

21                  **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

22                  Yes.

23

24

1  
2           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**  
3  
4  
5

6                           Or going through any elaborate  
7 Administrative Process. I mean it would basically be a  
8 light switch. It's a moot point now. There's no hearing.  
9 If the Army re-initiates that process for whatever reason  
10 then the hearing request doesn't have to be made. It's  
11 already been granted and their status has already been  
12 established so we would just go from that point on like we  
13 hadn't done anything and now we're doing something again.  
14 So it's - it's clear I think to the parties involved that  
15 this was an acceptable process and as a result that - that  
16 hearing has been mooted and any of the tasks that had been  
17 assigned either to the NRC or the Army are no longer  
18 required for that particular hearing. Okay. In September  
19 of last year the NRC acknowledged receipt of the Army's  
20 Possession Only License Amendment and then less than thirty  
21 (30) days later they sent us the Administrative Review  
22 Acceptance for that License Amendment. They are now  
23  
24



1 commencing and in the process of their Detailed Technical  
2 Review. If you are interested on where they stand on that I  
3 would suggest that you contact Dr. McLaughlin who is the NRC  
4 Program Manager for JPG at their headquarters in Rockville,  
5 Maryland. We have his information for contact in a slide  
6 that will come up here shortly. Because the NRC did in fact  
7 issue us an Administrative Acceptance Review they then  
8 issued a Federal Register Notice allowing for interested  
9 parties to request a hearing on the License Amendment. That  
10 was done in October/November of last year. Save the Valley  
11 did in fact request a hearing the end of November. The Army  
12 and the NRC staff responded to the Save the Valley hearing  
13 request and actually should take that question mark out as  
14 far as the date but approximately the date of January 8th,  
15 the hearing was in fact granted to Save the Valley and ah  
16 it's now currently in a state of suspension because no  
17 hearing can really be com - or conducted unless there's a  
18 completed file for everyone to refer back to. And that file  
19 will not be completed until at least the NRC completes their  
20 Detailed Technical Review and then the NRC comes out and  
21 does a series of public meetings out in the community to  
22 gather further input. And then assuming that there are

23  
24

1 still outstanding issues or concerns then there would be a  
2 hearing and that will probably be back in Maryland at the  
3 NRC Headquarters in Rockville but I don't know that for a  
4 fact. If you're interested about that particular detail ah  
5 I would suggest that you contact Dr. McLaughlin. Now as to  
6 the date when the NRC public meetings are going to be that  
7 will be up to them. That is their process. Would estimate  
8 probably sometime this summer but I don't think they could  
9 even give you an accurate date. But again right now again  
10 please contact Dr. McLaughlin if ah you want to ask that  
11 question. Copies of the Environmental Monitoring Plan that  
12 the Army submitted as the Proposed License Amendment for  
13 Possession Only are on the JPG web site and this address is  
14 going to have to change. And I will address that. But if  
15 you access the new ah web site now, which I'll talk about in  
16 a minute, and you go to the DU section you can scroll down  
17 and you will find those particular documents there. This is  
18 the NRC Program Manager's point of contact information. It  
19 hasn't changed. Again I think Dr. McLaughlin is a lonely  
20 guy so please contact him. He would love to hear from you.

21 And this is the Army's point of contact is our Radiation  
22 Safety Officer. In fact Ms. Kuykendall is here tonight.

23

24

1       Joyce do you want to raise your hand so that people will  
2       know who our Radiation Safety Officer is? (Raising hand).  
3       And she's located with me back in Aberdeen Proving Ground in  
4       Maryland. Now before we get to the comments and questions  
5       there's one (1) other slide that ah there's a handout on and  
6       it identifies the new web site address for the JPG web site.  
7       Ah if you have access to a military network you can access  
8       that site right now. And unfortunately most of the public  
9       does not. I have identified that problem and within the  
10      next twenty-four (24) to forty-eight (48) hours it should be  
11      available to anyone on - that has Internet access anywhere.  
12      They are correcting that problem. It was something that -  
13      you know it's an internal automatic thing and - and they  
14      didn't even think about it when they transferred the - the  
15      web site from a piece of equipment that's up in  
16      Massachusetts down to Aberdeen Proving Ground. And when I  
17      tried to access it after I was notified the work had been  
18      done I couldn't do it from the Proving Ground. So I  
19      contacted them yesterday and they said within twenty-four  
20      (24) to forty-eight (48) hours. So hopefully by the end of  
21      tomorrow or possibly by Monday you should be able to access  
22      it. The only thing that's changed is the - is the address.

23

24

1 All the contents should still be there as it was before.  
2 And if you do have any questions regarding that once it  
3 comes available please contact me and we will see what the  
4 problem is. Now any comments or questions? Are we going to  
5 set a record tonight?  
6

7 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

8 Everybody wants to get - go on home I guess.  
9

10 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

11 I guess. Richard?  
12

13 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

14 Ah we, you and I have talked briefly the  
15 other day about the - just at least mentioning the Proposed  
16 Plan.  
17

18 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

19 Yes.  
20

21 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

22 Do you want to say a few words of a  
23  
24

1 descriptive nature about what that is and what's coming up  
2 on that?

3

4 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

5 Sure. Be glad to.

6

7 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

8 Okay.

9

10 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

11

12

13 What Richard is referring to is the  
14 environmental document that the Army has been working on and  
15 has gotten to a stage now where they have provided the  
16 State, the EPA and Richard as the community co-chair for the  
17 RAB for review and comment on the Proposed Plan. Actually  
18 the State and the EPA have seen it for a while but was just  
19 given to the community a little while ago. And when I mean  
20 the community I mean the RAB co-chair. There is a  
21 requirement that when you get to a certain stage which is  
22 just a little bit beyond where we are now that there be a

23

24

1 public meeting to formally present that to the generic  
2 public and then allow them a comment period usually it's  
3 about thirty (30) days. Ah we had hoped that that would  
4 coincide with this particular meeting but we had to slip it  
5 by about three (3) weeks. So three (3) weeks from tonight  
6 we are scheduling a meeting that will be here in the library  
7 that will present that Proposed Plan. Now we have reserved  
8 the meeting space here. I've not sent out the letters yet.  
9 We're waiting to be absolutely sure but we're about ninety-  
10 eight (98) percent sure that that will occur right now.  
11 Well I'm ninety-eight and a half (98 1/2) or ninety-nine  
12 (99) percent sure. Probably next week I will send out a  
13 letter to the mailing list and we will have a notice in the  
14 Madison Courier that the meeting is scheduled for Thursday,  
15 February 26th here at seven o'clock (7:00). And there will  
16 be copies available of the Plan if anybody wants to pick one  
17 (1) up at that time. It's about fifty (50) to sixty (60)  
18 pages. It's not a lot of work to read but it is rather  
19 technical. That's - what Kevin just raised there  
20 (indicating) is probably with some minor changes what you  
21 will see but it's not the exact thing you will see because  
22 we are probably going to make some minor changes between now

1 and the time that it's available in a few weeks. Anyway  
2 that - once that Proposed Plan has gone out to the public,  
3 we received any input from them and we either modified the  
4 documents or responded to those comments and made no  
5 changes, then we will start staffing the document within the  
6 Army so that we can go on to the next step which is a Record  
7 of Decision. That Record of Decision is the formal step  
8 onto the hazardous substance law CERCLA or the SuperFund law  
9 that documents the process and identifies the steps that  
10 will be taken at whatever sites are going forward to  
11 actually be cleaned up at the Proving Ground that have  
12 environmental contamination, not Unexploded Ordnance. We've  
13 already addressed that issue but the things that have  
14 solvents or heavy metals or things of that nature. And it  
15 will identify those sites and what's going to be done at  
16 those sites. We are hoping that that Record of Decision  
17 will be signed ah sometime this summer or early fall. Once  
18 that Record of Decision is signed then we will get into  
19 what's called the RD or Remedial Design and that's basically  
20 a document that says okay, we're going to go to this one (1)  
21 site and we're going to remove so many cubic yards of dirt  
22 and this is how we are going to do it and these are all the

23

24

1       protections and the sampling and analysis that we're going  
2       to do to verify that we got the dirt that has any  
3       contamination in it. And if we have a ground water  
4       contamination problem then we're going to either install  
5       more wells or we're going to monitor these wells and these  
6       are things that we're going to sample for to prove that the  
7       substances that are still in the ground water are actually  
8       dissipated and going away. And that's how we're going to  
9       address that. This document will address all of that. And  
10      once the Remedial Design is done we'll actually get into  
11      what's called the RA which is the Removal Action, actually  
12      going in and taking out the dirt or you're cleaning up the  
13      water or installing new ground water wells. And that - when  
14      that's basically done hopefully in about a year, maybe a  
15      little bit more, fifteen (15) or eighteen (18) months we'll  
16      be just about where Richard said we'll be. We will be  
17      pretty close to the end of the tunnel at JPG. The Army is  
18      hoping to be what we call Remedy in Place at all the places  
19      that the Proving Ground south of the firing line whether  
20      it's environmental contamination by the end of September of  
21      next year. And then all we have to do is prove that  
22      whatever we've done is - if it's something that wasn't just

23  
24



1 a straight dirt removal operation but it's something more  
2 lengthy that it's actually operating successfully and we can  
3 transfer the last couple of parcels and ah the Army will be  
4 done south of the firing line. That was probably a little  
5 long winded. I hope I didn't confuse anyone. If you have  
6 any questions please feel free to ask.

7

8 **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

9 Paul the Proposal Plan is the document that  
10 goes to the public so that it explains what remedies were  
11 considered for the ah - ah the environmental contamination  
12 sites. And then it also presents the remedy that has been  
13 selected and will be implemented to take care of that  
14 problem. Okay? And then it also presents and is required  
15 to show an evaluation criteria. There's a standard  
16 evaluation criteria that - that has to be followed. So  
17 that's also presented in there and for each one (1) of those  
18 remedies it's got to go through that process. So they -  
19 that it can explain to you that this remedy is protective  
20 and it - of the human health and the environment. So that -  
21 the Proposed Plan is very specific because its intent is to  
22 pre - is for the public. It's there for the community. So

23

24

1       it's a very important step. Everything from that will  
2       decide what's in the Record of Decision.

3

4               **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

5                               Peggy?

6

7               **MS. PEGGY VLEREBOME:**

8                               When and where will copies of that be  
9       available?

10

11              **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

12                              Well they will be available that night here  
13       when we hold the meeting which is right now scheduled for  
14       February 26th.

15

16              **MS. PEGGY VLEREBOME:**

17                              How can people read it and be ready to  
18       comment on it if they just get it that night?

19

20              **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

21                              Well it's not that we're going to require  
22       them to comment on it that night. There's going to be at

23

24

1       least a thirty (30) day comment period subsequent to that  
2       time.

3

4                   **MS. PEGGY VLEREBOME:**

5                               I see.

6

7                   **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

8                               It's not that okay you've had it for  
9       thirteen (13) seconds. No comments? We're done. Bye. No.  
10       It doesn't work like that.

11

12                   **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

13                               Statutorily they have to give a thirty (30)  
14       day public comment period upon release of the documents.  
15       They also have to have a meeting, a community meeting, a  
16       public meeting to present the same information verbally and  
17       to receive verbal comments from the community. All comments  
18       will be documented. All comments have to be addressed and -  
19       and there has to be a response. And that would be taken  
20       care of in the - within the Record of Decision. There's an  
21       appendix in the Record of Decision that's called the  
22       Response of this Summary. And that incorporates all the

23

24

1 public comments, all the comments from ah the regulators or  
2 anything else. But regulators, obviously we've had a chance  
3 to review it and to participate and to have input into what  
4 kind of remedies are selected. And so for the most part it  
5 really comes down to the community. And the community has a  
6 right to request an extension if they feel that the thirty  
7 (30) days is not sufficient to go through the document.

8

9 **MS. PEGGY VLEREBOME:**

10 Who is over that? Like if somebody in the  
11 public or somebody wants an extension who would you go to?

12

13 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

14 It would have to come to the Army as long as  
15 it was "a reasonable request" not only in time but  
16 explanation as to why the request is being made then it will  
17 probably be granted. Obviously if someone asked for two (2)  
18 years because they're going out of the country on an  
19 extended round the world cruise that might be a little hard  
20 to grant. But if it was a thirty (30) or sixty (60) days --

21

22 **MR. KEN KNOUF:**

23

24

1 I'd like to go along.

2

3 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

4 If it was a thirty (30) or sixty (60) day,  
5 forty-five (45) day extension and they explained why and it  
6 was reasonable it would probably be granted.

7

8 **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

9 For example, Continental Steel SuperFund  
10 site in Kokomo, Indiana I was responsible for the Proposed  
11 Plan on that site. It was an eighty-five million  
12 (\$85,000,000) dollar Proposed Plan. It had five (5)  
13 different operable units, very complex ground water issues.  
14 There was an extension requested because of the complexity  
15 and it was easily granted. There was a - there was a ninety  
16 (90) day extension on that because of the complexity of that  
17 - that particular SuperFund site.

18

19 **MS. PEGGY VLEREBOME:**

20 Will this Proposed Plan be on the web site?

21

22 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

23

24

1 Yes.

2

3 **MS. PEGGY VLEREBOME:**

4 Do you know when that will be posted?

5

6 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

7 Probably just before the 26th. It depends  
8 on when I get the Final Revision which will probably come  
9 out to me within the next couple of weeks. But I won't know  
10 that specifically other than that's about as close as I can  
11 estimate right now. But we will put it up on the web. Ken?

12

13 **MR. KEN KNOUF:**

14 We have a couple of members of the public  
15 who would like the articulate young man on our left here to  
16 identify himself. They're overwhelmed with his knowledge  
17 but they don't know who he is.

18

19 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

20 Kevin?

21 **MS. MARY CLASHMAN:**

22 Well I think everyone should introduce

23

24

1       themselves if they're part of the staff or part of something  
2       like that. How would we know?

3

4               **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

5                       My name is Kevin Herron. I'm the Project  
6       Manager for the Indiana Department of Environmental  
7       Management.

8

9               **MS. MARY CLASHMAN:**

10                      Why didn't you introduce yourself when you  
11       started talking?

12

13               **MS. MEREDITH GREGG:**

14                      He will the next time.

15

16               **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

17                      I apologize but I've been coming here for  
18       five (5) years and it's pretty much been the same people.  
19       But I missed this time. And I'm sorry.

20

21               **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

22                      Any other comments or questions? Richard I

23

24

1 think we're going to set a record. Pretty close.

2

3 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

4 I think.

5

6 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

7 I'll have to make sure it rains from now on.

8

9 **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

10 It might not be so easy in three (3) weeks.

11

12 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

13 Oh I'm sure it won't be. But the Corps has  
14 got the burden for the presentation of the Proposed Plan and  
15 I'll let Brooks - I mean I'll be here but we'll let them do  
16 most of the talking as long as he doesn't deviate from Army  
17 policy.

18

19 **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

20 Well he hasn't asked for any help yet.

21

22 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

23

24



1                   Okay. The next RAB meeting is scheduled for  
2     April 28th and it's scheduled for the public library in  
3     North Vernon, seven (7) P.M. That's a Wednesday. And here  
4     is the schedule for the public meetings fro the rest of the  
5     year and as you can see we will be in North Vernon, April;  
6     we'll come back here in August; and then in November we will  
7     be up at Versailles in the Ripley Elementary School. That's  
8     - that's all I have for this evening. I appreciate your  
9     coming out in the inclement weather. If you have any  
10    additional questions feel free to ask. Other than that I  
11    have no other comments other than to remind you to pick up a  
12    copy of the slides, make sure you signed in on the  
13    attendance sheet, if you changed your address please  
14    indicate so. And Richard do you have any closing remarks?

15

16                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

17                   I think you've pretty well covered the  
18    closing remarks. I can't think of anything else.

19

20                   **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

21                   Okay. Thank you very much. We're done.

22

\* \* \* \* \*

23

24

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

CONCLUSION OF HEARING

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF INDIANA            )  
                                  ) SS:  
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON        )

I, Sharon Shields, do hereby certify that I am a Notary Public in and for the County of Jefferson, State of Indiana, duly authorized and qualified to administer oaths; That the foregoing public hearing was taken by me in shorthand and on a tape recorder on February 5, 2004 in the Madison-Jefferson County Public Library, 420 West Main Street, Madison, IN; That this public hearing was taken on behalf of the Jefferson Proving Ground Restoration Advisory Board pursuant to agreement for taking at this time and place; That the testimony of the witnesses was reduced to typewriting by me and contains a complete and accurate transcript of the said testimony.

I further certify that pursuant to stipulation by and between the respective parties, this testimony has been transcribed and submitted to the Jefferson Proving Ground

1 Restoration Advisory Board.

2 WITNESS my hand and notarial seal this \_\_\_\_\_ day of  
3 February, 2004.

4 \_\_\_\_\_  
5 Sharon Shields, Notary Public  
6 Jefferson County, State of Indiana

7 My Commission Expires: July 2, 2007

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24